| • | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 09/944,049 | SCHALL ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| · | Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D. | 1648 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | _ |
| (1) Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D. | (3) | |
| (2) Romy Celli. | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 25 February 2005 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: Fax of proposed amendment. | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: 111, 112 Prior art documents discussed: none | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: MM said she had to either renegotiate allowed claims or withdraw case from issue, offered proposal to amend claims. RC considering proposal. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary | examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview |
| | | |
| Nouthols | | |
| (Examiner/SRE Signature) (Applicant/ | Applicant's Representative Signature | gnature – if appropriate) |